

### Natural disasters.

It has come to mind that something may be able to be done about natural disasters, being things like earthquakes and tornadoes.

First i would like to speak about earthquakes. earthquakes are where the ground goes through realignment with the plates that adjust to feel more comfortable and relieve stress on them due to weight on them. they obviously go down into the ground, as that is where they fill the gaps and find a place for themselves.

This can be remedied by building divisions or walls or foundation style walls, between certain parts of the city and the rest. these should be like divisions in the foundations of a house, separating the earth for a mile or so under the earth. this will keep the pressure coming into the cities divided so as not to combine and compliment each other, dividing the areas that are affected.

To stop hurricanes, we need to merely send a current of wind out to meet it, seeing as how they are made of hot air, they could have their momentum taken away with normal bombs, yes? these can be dropped into the maw of them, and then take the most out of it.

Of course, the earthquakes could use some more work, yes? this would be where we would use sewerage mains to have poles coming out of them, into the earth, cheaply and quickly being set up, with them interconnecting to divert the 'pressure.'

Don't you know how you always see certain like quad blocks of buildings falling? this is where it is most pressurized and if we were to be able to balance the pressure, the poles will redirect the vibrations to cover the whole network, of course.

Now for tsunamis. these are tidal waves that will wipe out a coast line, also common in japan. i really feel for people that are subjected to this rather often, so let's see what we can do about it?

If we were to observe that they have built a sea wall, what could slow the tsunami down even further is dropping bombs into it from aircraft. that will take most of the sting out of it, and then we could build a barrier in the ocean. this would be made easier with old oil rigs that we gather together 'in a row' and then cement into place.

Dropping cement into the ocean can be done easily, but that actually sounds like a lot of cement. instead, we could chain the old oil rigs together, and have them portable, and then erect a 'curtain' of something like wire fences to slow the tsunami down.

They can be portable and then drop anchor to stop the tsunami. i don't think the tsunami will destroy a chain of these oil rigs, but the cost of replacing them is far cheaper than building the beach front over again, yes?

### Better working conditions.

Now, you might be asking, what is a 'smurf?' this is the term i give to all workers that work happily and conscientiously or with great attention put into their work and are stress free.

Let's start with stress? stress is stored energy, so, putting your energy to work with your work is beneficial, as it will bear fruit and make you feel better.

If you were to bring your personal life into work, you will be bringing things that bore you to work, or, that you worry about, bore you and worry you, these are the things most people at work worry about, which is natural. i mean, do you usually think of ways to enjoy yourself, or do you think about your problems? problems need to be dealt with, but if they are not related to work, they should not be thought of at work. making your problems other people's problems will stress you out further, as, you will then be thinking of what they are thinking of you, yes? this will be where they say it is not that bad, usually, and then they hope you will leave them alone, of course. it is fruitless to discuss your problems, as then you are thinking everyone is worrying about you, and then you worry about yourself even more, justifying your worries onto others. this means you will be, if anything good, spreading your worries to others that need to work, or, at worst, wasting time you could be spending on other things that relieve stress, of course.

So, leaving your problems at the door is a good idea. you do not want to lose your job by talking about your gambling, drinking or marital affairs, do you? if this dominates your work, you will be collecting stress instead of using work as the best place to relieve stress, yes?

How does one relieve stress at work? well, first of all, you will be able to put effort into your work. this will be where you focus on your work and find success with it, very relieving if i must say so from my experiences.

If you were to shrug your responsibilities, then you would have more to worry about. you know those people that don't do their work and leave everything till the last minute? they think this is somehow cool or something to admire. this rebellion stems from high school, where it is highly thought of to rage against the machine. this is where people cannot be fired, because of contract stipulations, and, then they abuse the right to get away with not working to waste time, collecting stress, of course!

Don't you feel relieved if you hand in some good work, and hear a "well done?" beating the target times for tasks always let's you relax at the end of the day, but, if you do that, you will collect stress! this is because doing nothing is boring, and boredom is the worst kind of stress. i say that boredom is the worst kind of stress because it is where your muscles are relaxing, yes? this is where you have no 'focus,' unless in a meeting or mock meeting, and then you divert your attention to all sorts of things you cannot change.

You will always think of things you cannot change, because there is a little hitler inside all of us. this is where you will 'stress' or 'fret' over things you cannot change, of course, day dreaming could be another word for it. this is stressful because you are willing it into being, and the stress that comes back to you due to the reactions in your mind or in real life, makes this terribly disappointing - failure.

So we are faced with completing work - success - and day dreaming or fretting - failure. which do you think is better to do?

So, doing something and bearing fruit for others to admire is good, and worrying about people that you cannot change is bad. too many times do people bring their personal lives into the work place, and this sets the work back. relaxing is asking for trouble, as, you should either be working or asking for more work, as then there is more fruit. imagine having people see you reclining in your chair and looking at you like you are the bad guy here?

I think it has to do with them not wanting to work, and justifying it with you not working. then, they also say, for reason, that they do not want to work, and relax.

On the other hand, if you were to put pressure on others to work, your immediate circle will respond by working harder, at least, as they will see work being done and managers watching every now and again.

Bringing managers into it will help you make others work. this is contagious, as, if you are to inspire others to work, they will send the same energy your way.

It is a little known fact that people influence each other's attitudes. think of a small town, laid back and friendly. then think of a big city where someone has no time for someone else, then that feeling spreads?

Spread the right kind of feelings and sentiments

Now i would like to revise channeling energy in the work place. this is where your collected energy equals stress. it is energy because it stiffens up your muscles, as they do when you use them too much. naturally, this is stored energy without being used, as when you, for example, jog, you would be exchanging energy inside your legs. as mass is stored energy, this exchange means that, since no energy ever is destroyed, must be changing forms to charge your muscles, and that is why they get sore and stiff.

So, your neck and brain and all your other muscles are being used and converting energy from sugar and fuels to use them up, and leave behind a depleted zone of no fuels and only muscles that need to get rid of the energy. this is why going for an exercise after work, like to the gym, would see the energy converting from stress and usable energy to 'left over energy.'

I know a lot of you are still asking what i am on about talking about relaxing as being stressful? well, this is relaxing your muscles too much, and, due to this, they stress you out, as your body knows that they are losing stamina as you are not using them. as some of you may know, if you leave your car in the garage for too long, it will not drive as well, as the gears will have not been oiled or oiled due to use for a long time. so, what does it mean to 'oil yourself?'

This would be like using the 'gears of your body.' it is known that people go senile if they do not talk enough to others and socialize, but that is not needed in the work place - what you need to do there is channel energy, of course. this would be where you use energy, and low amounts of fuels, by typing - think, now, if you use your fingers you are not affecting your heart or lungs much, are you?

So, to expel energy in the form of stress this way takes energy from inside you, like adrenaline, and puts it to use. we have adrenaline to aid us when we need to excel, and slowly releasing chemicals this way makes for a very pleasant experience.

I am trying to make you enjoy work as much as i did, honestly. the way i would describe my work was the same as what i have said here, and, i think i have justified myself enough so far.

So, why did i like to work so much? there must be a pattern somewhere to show you how to enjoy work...

Maybe it is down to attitude, maybe it is down to channeling stress, maybe it is down to being in my own little world? how can you create world like this for yourself though?

If you were to just try to use work to escape from your problems, instead of using your work time to worry about your personal life, and your own time to worry about your work, we would have a situation that equals failure instead of success, and we know it is stressful to fail, yes?

I don't know how much more i can share with you, i have tried my best thus far to try to turn your work into paradise, of course.

As for factory workers, it is a little bit different to office workers. i know at the moment that factory workers rotate shifts and machines to keep them from being bored at one position, but this is not an aspiration or target goal of the worker, as the worker is dreaming of authority at least, yes?

This is why there are team leaders. rotating your team leaders may make for a better work environment, as they can all take turns for one week, then the next week the best person can be the team leader for everybody, and, if people complain then the rotation starts over again. this will find the best people for authority i reckon.

Then, there is the need to feel appreciated. this could be supplied by giving bonuses to people that meet their targets, and then a competitive edge with these bonuses as there will be a bonus amount for everyone to share based on the profit excess of the company, maybe coming to roughly one percent of the total excess they make. or they could take their bonuses from the other workers - if one worker is helping someone else after their targets are met, then the 'helper' gets to take a little bit of the 'helped employee's' wages? this rule would make everyone fight to have their own work finished by themselves, or, they could accept that they need help and are getting paid according to how much they make.

Which brings me to commission. this is where salaries base can be lowered in favor of 'company economic climate.' if business is good, and everyone is hauling, then they get commission. if there are no orders or quality is low, then they get less commission. this is the only way to do business in today's economic climate, as when you send samples, you will usually get a good order if they are good quality or the right price, if not, it is the workers fault, yes? this means that when seasons are down, the workers get less commission, of course, or get to take unpaid leave.

Justifying this to the lawyers they might bring in would be rather easy - they work for the company, they get paid if the company gets paid. this will force them into getting on a company phone to try to find orders, which means training in this with a salesperson. this quick remedy will work on most of the factory workers, as they know there is a bonus coming if there is work.

Look at your phone book. if it has a thousand pages, understand that there are at least twenty potential customers within. understand that there are others struggling with orders and quality, and, that if you are desperate enough, you will find orders. this whole world is out there waiting for you, and you can have a slice of it at only the cost of a phone call and a good ante or presentation.

Every company has a team, and, the impetus lies in sales. if the workers can help the sales team get orders by using the phone book, and telling the sales team the specs, and, what they have recently made and for whom, then they are a important part of the team, and if they get orders, they should get a share. if not, then the business is going down and they will all be out of work, and, the owner will have to sell or liquidate the business.

Workers are not fools, they have a great knowledge of what components or material they are using from observing the flow of the business. then the sales team should go to the factory to observe and listen to what is going on in the factory, and the workers can explain to them why things should change if they must.

On the note of making work more fun for factory workers, we should maybe, instead of giving them money for targets met, buy them lunch? this will sit well with them, as, if they do their work, they get to eat for free which you buy in bulk, making it much cheaper, a business within a business if you will. this resembles wine farms paying their staff with wine, of course.

People are scared of earning commission, as they do not get to plan for a bad week. if they are to have security, they need to be paid a decent steady wage, although this does not encourage quality of work or pace. the thing is, this is a capitalist set up, you should get paid more for what you do. if it was a communist set up, which is what this alludes to, then they would not be motivated.

If a worker is called upon to give a report on something, the report can be drawn up by all the workers, with the best one being used by sales and that person getting a few extra monies. this level of intimacy with the products means that they will have quite a vast knowledge of, due to job rotation, how the product works and what to look for in terms of quality.

Then, maybe there should be media about factory work 'drawn up?' i am talking about a 'business paper' or magazine where everyone gets to tell each other what is going on in the business. this will bring ideas together, or form new ideas for the factory or wherever they work.

If a worker is called upon to try to make an order, they should have it scripted by the sales team or their manager, and test it on other sales staff first.

But, one thing they can reliably do, is place orders with suppliers. this they can sit around all day on the phone with them, and, find out if the products they buy are cheap enough compared to what is going around. having a knowledge of the workplace, they will know what to look for regarding qualities of the materials or products.

Other places the blue collar or floor staff could be used is with the recording of what is being produced in other departments. this will not lead to buddying up and saying that these targets were met, they will be honest in stock counting.

Also, a stock take could happen every week during work time. if everyone is involved with what they did that week, they could easily count up everything each thursday in an hour before logging off. this would let the sales team have extensive knowledge of what they have in stock each week for friday dispatch, where things travel by sea over the weekend.

Maybe the other staff could make an app that will let every staff member communicate with each other and the floor staff by sort of like a 'chat room function?' this will let people talk and communicate better with the whole business, and, then everyone will be more informed?

Now, what can managers do to make their lives, and, the lives of those under them easier? well there is a lot they can do, i think? they are the people that control the stress levels of the staff - one word can make them relax and work happily or breaks stuff, usually. having this much influence on the work force means that they will make or break the day, week or month for all the people under them.

There is the friendly approach. if they were to be nice to everybody, and listen to them, they will be called 'a good boss.' this will make them happier as a boss, but, will also make people try to take advantage of them, of course.

There is the hard boss. this type of boss will get the results their way or the people will be disciplined. this will be bad for the morale of the workers, and everybody will avoid talking to the boss about their problems, of course.

There are many different management styles for each manager to use, but combining them to be a 'firm hand' instead of too easy or too hard means that they might get the best out of workers, yes? this is of course an obvious alternative to either being nice or hard, yes?

When you set a task's completion time, you should set it so they can easily see it through - setting it one day before they actually have to send it means they will be done on time and it can be sent early, or, they will have time to complete it that day. this i call 'min-maxing' where if you are counting on someone, you count on them to not do so well, and if you are buying something, you count on it to be a bit more expensive. of curse, the other way around would be for the profits to be regarded as minimally as possible, as then the company will have planned, or, will have more profit than they spent or planned for, leaving lee way for the companies accounts and so forth. if you are trying to have something delivered to your company, you plan for it to be 'late' and there to be hidden costs upon delivery, as then you have 'planned against failure' of things you cannot control.

These are some of the tips i have for managers. don't expect too much of others, expect too much of yourself, or, that you will expect things not to go so well, and, make sure you have covered all your staff, saying, "it is my problem."

#### Back taxes for a big company.

This is where the country joins a union to have benefits for all it's members. some of this money will go to eastern europe, where it is most needed, but that is not enough. depending on how many people could afford apple products or any other products in their country means that they would be losing a lot of money for the sake of the rich countries, who see their money depleted by not investing in other countries, but more on that later.

If a first world country makes a product, it will cost more to make it, and, that is why if this goes through, they should invest in a poorer country like in eastern europe to bring them enough money to buy, for example, german goods. this promotes bigger trade, of course.

Now, if the taxes are too much for now, and they go through, maybe apple or any other big company could rather pledge to invest in certain countries, maybe more than what the taxation was? this special case is available to big companies, and, it would serve everyone better, yes?

Economics is something i stray into very seldom, as i prefer the market and business angles. none the less, i have thought up a very important thing i wish to share with you - 'neighbor economics.' this is where you can enrich yourself by enriching your neighboring countries of course, or, merely trading partners.

If you are a rich country, and you want to get richer, you need to enrich your neighbors if they are 'poor.' this is because then they will be able to afford your goods. if you are rich and they are poor, it costs more for you to make the same goods than them, and then you buy their goods anyway because it is cheaper.

If a poor country buys goods from a rich neighbor, then it will probably not sell, as it would be too expensive. this is because the 'first world' pays more for materials and staff workers than the poorer country, and then the goods, may go from the rich country to the poor country, if any are bought at all, and then the poor country sits with a lot of expensive goods that nobody can afford. this means the poor country needs to cut prices on 'rich country goods' to sell them, so the goods were made at a high cost and sold for a miserly sum. this means, of course, the poor will stay poor while the rich will stay where they are.

If a rich country wants to get richer, they need to enrich the poorer neighboring countries. this will be where they invest in that country, to up it's production to make 'first world goods.' then, that country will be able to sell international goods locally, and then it will see great returns on taxation, and, on a private level. remember, the state cannot enrich a business without it costing the state and therefore tax payers, and taxes from companies cannot be paid unless they are making profits. this means the private sector needs to make money to pay for taxes for more service delivery, leading to new product related needs from the tax payers.

So, the best thing for a rich country to do to get richer is sell it's goods internationally, and, that means everybody else needs to be able to afford it's goods.

If you were to invest in a poor country, you could establish cheaper goods from your country, to their private sector, to their shops, and get paid all the same.

### Refugees.

When wars break out, there are often refugees from certain countries at war going to other countries to seek refuge. if the other country takes them in, they need a plan so that they do not become a 'welfare state,' of course.

So, how does the country taking in refugees help them without harming their economy irreparably? the whole process of one country losing it's citizen labor force, losing it's taxes due to war destabilizing their economy, and the new arrivals for the new country makes it very hard to see through to a good conclusion, yes?

If we were to observe this occurrence, we could say that the labor force has moved from one place to another where they cannot work. this is why the new country needs to hire them quickly into jobs where they can feed themselves at least and hopefully soon pay taxes, of course.

This could be where the prior country could ship or dispatch the machinery to the new country, where the business can set up quickly. to help them, land and buildings could be built by the new country and the machines moved in. the new country could see investors buy these machines for their worth, and then they could get to work, yes?

Or, the new country could merely begin subsistence farming? this would be where the farmers or subsistence farmers from the old country and give them land and seeds to see what becomes of them. this could be where the farmers teach the citizens how to farm, and then they could at least eat, which is enough for refugees to live i think, yes?

Or, they could empty the accounts of the citizens into the new villages they will build for them, with cheap housing, of course. all this would require is a few slips to be signed by the people moving to the new country for the state of the new country to collect funds for them to build houses and places of work, of course.

## Prostitution.

This is one of the oldest jobs in the world. ever since the days of the cave men, women have been selling their bodies for the sake of the men to 'have at it,' and then they keep the dividends for themselves. then, the fathers of these women were selling their daughters since i can think of, and that was all fine and good. hell, even in the bible they quote people as selling their daughters to other people - saying that the religion is against prostitution is a fail, as it clearly supports it as 'just the way it was.'

Then, there is the legal aspect of it - women getting into drugs and then selling their bodies for the sake of getting drugs. this is quite common for hookers, but then so is selling drugs themselves.

Personally, i think some women want to be hookers to look cool or impress their friends. this activity starts in lower school, where girls will get gifts from boys to be their girlfriends. i know at some schools girls get rings from their boy friends and wear all of them after school, seeing it as a status symbol or so. this is not out and out sex, but it leads to dating, and, we know during dates men spend money on their women, or, buy their women. this is similar to escorts, where escorts accompany men in exchange for money and then maybe sex for more money.

So, can we get rid of prostitution? i don't think so. can we tax prostitutes for the sake of welfare? yes, i think so. this activity is unbeatable, and, if we accept it we can make other people's lives better from it, yes?

Next time you buy some woman a bouquet of flowers, are you trying to buy sex?

## Fighting recession.

They say nigeria has just entered into recession. this is because of negative economic growth, which means businesses have been shutting down their operations and making less money. this means that taxes have also gone down - there is less money to tax.

To overcome this, the state increase taxation on imports. this will mean, the rich will pay for the lost money, as they want to have international products and cars you could say. this would be like importing a nike sweater, and raising prices on it. this will mean that national sweaters would be cheaper, aiding the people that make them locally.

Then, they could also tax banks more. this would see the bank getting taxed more on it's money it holds for the use of the state.

But, why must all this money go tot he state? this is because the state needs to deliver essential services to the people. nobody is going to get hurt with these two measures thus far.

Why have the businesses been failing? that is because the money has been spent without entering circulation, and, that means the owners still have the money. this means they were doing business, but due to no local interest in local products, the money 'left nigeria.' this needs to change, with money being 'recovered' by observing owners, for their businesses closing down, or, due to lack of business, they have also lost money. or the money has left circulation due to paranoia of the owners.

The money must still be in the banking sector. this means that the banks should be put under administration and the country invested in by the banks themselves, logically, of course.



## Millennium prize problems.

"The P versus NP problem is a major unsolved problem in computer science. Informally speaking, it asks whether every problem whose solution can be quickly verified by a computer can also be quickly solved by a computer...

...Consider the subset sum problem, an example of a problem that is easy to verify, but whose answer may be difficult to compute. Given a set of integers, does some nonempty subset of them sum to 0? For instance, does a subset of the set  $\{-2, -3, 15, 14, 7, -10\}$  add up to 0? The answer "yes, because the subset  $\{-2, -3, -10, 15\}$  adds up to zero" can be quickly verified with three additions. There is no known algorithm to find such a subset in polynomial time (there is one, however, in exponential time, which consists of  $2^n - 1$  tries), but such an algorithm exists if  $P = NP$ ; hence this problem is in NP (quickly checkable) but not necessarily in P (quickly solvable).

An answer to the  $P = NP$  question would determine whether problems that can be verified in polynomial time, like the subset-sum problem, can also be solved in polynomial time. If it turned out that  $P \neq NP$ , it would mean that there are problems in NP (such as NP-complete problems) that are harder to compute than to verify: they could not be solved in polynomial time, but the answer could be verified in polynomial time." ~ wikipedia

So, we need to be able to solve and check these algorithms before we set the computer up to 'do' them. this means that we need to make an algorithm that solves them quickly, quickly enough for us to verify.

If  $p = np$ , then the obvious answers are  $n = 1$ , or, that the equation is 'a whole one.' this could not be though, as,  $n$  equals a prime number, and one is not a prime number, thus the prime working out to be equal to 'one' would be where  $p = 0.5$ , or,  $[p] = \text{anything to the power of or divided by one}$ .

Seeing as how  $[p]$  needs to equal  $[np]$  and anything times by  $[n]$  or  $[p]$  needs to equal  $[p]$ , then the answer comes with a 'to the power of,' or 'divided by' attached to it.

This means that we need to find the equation that  $[p]$  hides in. this would mean that it might be a remainder too! well, i am considering all aspects of it at this point. you could also say  $[n] = [1]$ , times  $[1]$  or even divided by  $[1]$ . saying that all together will mean making a new symbol though.

Of course, it might mean that  $n = [1x]$ , which would be an equation inside of an equation. of course, that could mean there are more of these out there, somewhere...

"In mathematics, the Riemann hypothesis is a conjecture that the Riemann zeta function has its zeros only at the negative even integers and the complex numbers with real part  $1/2$ . It was proposed by Bernhard Riemann (1859), after whom it is named. The name is also used for some closely related analogues, such as the Riemann hypothesis for curves over finite fields.

The Riemann hypothesis implies results about the distribution of prime numbers. Along with suitable generalizations, some mathematicians consider it the most important unresolved problem in pure mathematics (Bombieri 2000). The Riemann hypothesis, along with Goldbach's conjecture, is part of Hilbert's eighth problem in David Hilbert's list of 23 unsolved problems; it is also one of the Clay Mathematics Institute's Millennium Prize Problems.

The Riemann zeta function  $\zeta(s)$  is a function whose argument  $s$  may be any complex number other than 1, and whose values are also complex. It has zeros at the negative even integers; that is,  $\zeta(s) = 0$  when  $s$  is one of  $-2, -4, -6, \dots$ . These are called its trivial zeros. However, the negative even

integers are not the only values for which the zeta function is zero. The other ones are called non-trivial zeros. The Riemann hypothesis is concerned with the locations of these non-trivial zeros, and states that:

The real part of every non-trivial zero of the Riemann zeta function is  $1/2$ .

Thus, if the hypothesis is correct, all the non-trivial zeros lie on the critical line consisting of the complex numbers  $1/2 + it$ , where  $t$  is a real number and  $i$  is the imaginary unit." ~ wikipedia

If this is correct, then it why does every odd number have a 0.50 added to it? this would mean that there is a zero at every odd number. this would be where xxx7 halved  $[1/2] = 3.500...$  if it is any of the prime numbers, then it would be  $[3=] 1.50$ ,  $[5=] 2.50$ ,  $[7=] 3.50$ ,  $[9=] 4.50$  and  $[1=] 0.50$ .

All prime numbers end in either a one, three, five seven or nine. this is evident with all prime numbers that they will end in halves, or, point five if halved.

"In mathematical physics, the Yang–Mills existence and mass gap problem is an unsolved problem and one of the seven Millennium Prize Problems defined by the Clay Mathematics Institute, which has offered a prize of US\$1,000,000 to the one who solves it.

The problem is phrased as follows:[1]

Yang–Mills Existence and Mass Gap. Prove that for any compact simple gauge group  $G$ , a non-trivial quantum Yang–Mills theory exists on  $4\mathbb{R}$  and has a mass gap  $\Delta > 0$ . Existence includes establishing axiomatic properties at least as strong as those cited in Streater & Wightman (1964), Osterwalder & Schrader (1973) and Osterwalder & Schrader (1975).

In this statement, a Yang–Mills theory is a non-Abelian quantum field theory similar to that underlying the Standard Model of particle physics;  $4\mathbb{R}$  is Euclidean 4-space; the mass gap  $\Delta$  is the mass of the least massive particle predicted by the theory.

Therefore, the winner must prove that:

Yang–Mills theory exists and satisfies the standard of rigor that characterizes contemporary mathematical physics, in particular constructive quantum field theory,[2][3] and

The mass of the least massive particle of the force field predicted by the theory is strictly positive.

For example, in the case of  $G=\text{SU}(3)$ —the strong nuclear interaction—the winner must prove that glueballs have a lower mass bound, and thus cannot be arbitrarily light." ~ wikipedia.

This seems to me to be like radius to the power of four, would leave, at the power of 1, would mean that it would be double the radius, or, the diameter, at the power of three would be twice the volume, and, at the power of four would be four times the volume, leaving  $[4\mathbb{R}]$ . this would mean that the radius is leaving  $[4] \times [360 \text{ degrees}]$  radius, but, that would mean that this is also radius to the power  $[4]$ , coming to  $[4 \text{ degrees}]$ .

"The Navier–Stokes existence and smoothness problem concerns the mathematical properties of solutions to the Navier–Stokes equations, one of the pillars of fluid mechanics (such as with turbulence). These equations describe the motion of a fluid (that is, a liquid or a gas) in space. Solutions to the Navier–Stokes equations are used in many practical applications. However, theoretical understanding of the solutions to these equations is incomplete. In particular, solutions of

the Navier–Stokes equations often include turbulence, which remains one of the greatest unsolved problems in physics, despite its immense importance in science and engineering.

Even much more basic properties of the solutions to Navier–Stokes have never been proven. For the three-dimensional system of equations, and given some initial conditions, mathematicians have not yet proved that smooth solutions always exist, or that if they do exist, they have bounded energy per unit mass.[citation needed] This is called the Navier–Stokes existence and smoothness problem.

Since understanding the Navier–Stokes equations is considered to be the first step to understanding the elusive phenomenon of turbulence, the Clay Mathematics Institute in May 2000 made this problem one of its seven Millennium Prize problems in mathematics. It offered a US\$1,000,000 prize to the first person providing a solution for a specific statement of the problem:[1]

Prove or give a counter-example of the following statement:

In three space dimensions and time, given an initial velocity field, there exists a vector velocity and a scalar pressure field, which are both smooth and globally defined, that solve the Navier–Stokes equations." ~ wikipedia.

This would be [velocity] - [scalar pressure field] = rough and jagged. this is because the pressure is influenced by the velocity of the gas or liquid.

If it doesn't happen on earth, it won't happen in space. there is 'gravity' out there, coming from orbital bodies. this is evident with jupiter an saturn.

Of course, if there is gravitational pull, or whatever you want to call it, the liquids or gases will not be smooth. this is because they will need velocity to get them into space or leave a container. this is something it cannot do without, and, as we see on earth, the patterns of these things varies from glob to glob.